

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview conducted on January 29, 2004. During the interview the Examiner agreed that with the amendments made hereby, the present claim objections and rejections would be overcome and if a further search did not bring to light any more relevant art, the claims would be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-46 presently stand rejected and claim 10 is objected to because of informalities. Specifically, claim 10 is objected to for reciting the attendant functions of a "first" and "second" window in different order than was presented in claim 1. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-20, 23-34 and 37-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bayless et al. (USP 5,754,636) and claims 4, 9, 21, 22, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayless et al. in view of Nakanishi (USP 6,064,725). For the reasons set forth below, and in view of the present claim amendments, Applicant respectfully traverses the objection and rejections and requests favorable disposition of the application.

Argument

In regard to the objection of claim 10, Applicant has amended claim 10 to be consistent with the other claims. In particular, the claim has been amended such that the "first window" is the window from which the call is originated and the "second window" is the window from which data is extracted. Although Applicant submits that the designation of "first" and "second" are arbitrary and refer to the order in which the specific window is recited in the claim, Applicant has amended the claim as suggested by the Examiner to advance prosecution of the application.

In regard to the §102 rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-20, 23-34 and 37-46, Applicant submits that Bayless et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every feature set forth in independent claims 1, 5, 10, 23 and 46 and, thus, does not anticipate these claims. Specifically, unlike rejected claims 1, 5, 10, 23 and 46, Bayless et al. does not disclose a method or device in which a collection of character information is selected from within one window that is displayed on a display unit, e.g., a “second window”, a telephone number being extracted from among the selected character information and displayed on a different window displayed on the display unit at the same time as the other window, e.g., a “first window”, and where a phone call is generated from the window containing the telephone number and the selected character information is stored in a directory for future retrieval.

Bayless et al. discloses telecommunications system that provides for services to be accessed via a computer system. (abstract) The system in Bayless et al., however, is completely different from the claimed invention. For example, the Examiner asserts that the claimed first and second windows of claims 1, 5, 10, 23 and 46 are disclosed by the “make and answer call” and the “merged directory” features, respectively, of Bayless et al. These two features of Bayless et al., however, are completely different from, and not equivalent to, the recited first and second windows of the claims for several reasons. First, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, there is no disclosure, either explicit or implicit, in Bayless et al. that the call window 390, illustrated in FIG. 34, is displayed simultaneously with any of the windows illustrated in FIG. 14. More particularly, Bayless et al. does not disclose two separate windows displayed simultaneously where information is selected from within one window, a portion of the data

extracted and the extracted portion displayed within the other window for purpose of dialing a telephone call. Moreover, Bayless et al. does not disclose storing all of the information selected from within one of the windows in an a directory.

The call window 390 displays information regarding each of one or more telephone calls that are being conducted at any given time. The information displayed includes such things as call status, e.g., active, on-hold, conference, etc., call duration and information about the party or parties to whom a call is connected, e.g., name, telephone number, extension, etc. However, there is no disclosure in Bayless et al. that the call window 390 is in any way associated with a dialing function. Additionally, there is no disclosure that the data from any of the windows shown in FIG. 14 are for selecting data from which a number to be dialed is then extracted and placed into call window 390. For at least these reasons, Bayless et al. does not anticipate any of claims 1-46, in particular, claims 1, 5, 10, 23 and 46.

In regard to the §103 rejection of claims 4, 9, 21, 22, 35 and 36, Applicant submits that Nakinishi fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Bayless et al. discussed above. Accordingly, the proposed combination of Bayless et al. and Nakinishi does not, and cannot, render claims 4, 9, 21, 22, 35 and 36 obvious.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the application is believed to be in form for immediate allowance with claims 1-46, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to **contact the undersigned** at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln No. 09/392,619

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Barner
Registration No. 46,075

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 5, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: Q55694